9

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

A CASE STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE U.S. CONGRESS IN SHAPING THE AMERICAN STAND TOWARD PALESTINE

By

Fadhil Zaky Mohamad, PH.D.

Published by:

The Ministry of Culture and Guidance

1965 Baghdad

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

A CASE STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE U.S. CONGRESS IN SHAPING THE AMERICAN STAND TOWARD PALESTINE

By

Fadhil Zaky Mohamad, PH.D.

Printed at Al-Jumhuria House

PART I

No issue invites more tension than the issue of Palestine. Naturally, tension does not arise out of nothing; in the case of Palestine it has been the outcome of the creation of Israel; the offspring of political Zionism.[1]

Although it is not the purpose of this research to delve into the way various factors worked for the creation of the State of Israel, yet, some of the factors, although unique and irrelevant to modern practice, have a direct connection with our topic necessitating some elaboration.

The first unique attribute of the State of Israel is that, "rarely in history - at least, in modern history - has a majority of population fled a country in the face of a militant minority. Yet that is what happened in Palestine."[2] The human exodus of about one million Arabs from Palestine did not happen haphazardly, and was not the peoples's choise as is claimed by the Zionists and their supporters. For no group of great numbers such as the Palestinians, no human mass, in either the past or the present ever left their fatherland wilfully with nothing in their hands; and let their country be occupied by an enemy. The Palestinian tragedy can be explained and understood in plain words and with only a little common sense. That the Palestinian Arabs evacuated their homes and left their properties, not because of the Zionist threat in un-natural circumstances, but because of Arab leaders repeated

radio broadcasts runs short of common sense a bit. When a house even if the manager keeps shouting the contrary for a thousand times. The core of this matter resided in a single fact: "Zionism sets fire, no single occupant would be expected to remain idle, was determined to get ahead with its plans - and let Rome be set on fire. A Jewish State must be established and let the Carthage be destroyed. The Zionists, however, were faced with the dreadful question: How can a Jewish State be established on Arab land, and with such a great majority of Arab population.[3] The Arabs, and this is their right, will not accept Jewish Sovereignty, nor will they abandon their lands. To Zionism, that was an obstinate fact which had to be confronted. The Jewish State would either be established by sheer brutal force, or be abandontd. The choice had to be made, and it was made. Zionism decided: The Jewish State must be established, and the Arabs must be diven out of their country. And this is exactly — what has taken place. Under unspeakable terror, bloodshed, and destruction, the defenseless people of Palestine were driven out of their towns, villages, and homes. Their homeland was usurped, and the so called State of Israel was established."[4]

The Second important and unique characteristic of the State of Israel was that is proclaimed itself a national state, yet it lacked all the classical attributes of nationhood. Classical attributes of nationhood are consciousness, volition, and common tongue. Before the rise of Zionism, the Hebrew language was by all purposes a dead language. Further, national conciousness and national volition, as the terms are understood in modern times did not apply to Zionist Israel. A situation as such left only "religion and race for Zionism to fall back upon. But each of these two elements would raise more problems than it would solve for Zionism. Accordingly, Zionism preferred to meet the first ideological challenge it faced by evasiveness, equivocation, ambiguity and a considerable amount of double talk —".[5] Strange as it may sound, "there is nowadays in Israel a heated debate — pregnant with political implications — over the question "what is a Jew?"

This debate has caused many a political crisis within Israel in recent years, culminating in the resignation of the government not long ago. And the best that the corporate wisdom of the movement and the State has been able to produce has been a series of directives and amendments jointly stipulating that for the purpose of official registration, a Jew is a person who can prove his adherence to Judaism by documents issued by an authorized (i.e., orthodox) rabbinate or who can prove his descent from at least a Jewish mothor."[6] Paradoxically enough, this does not hold back very far. "Not only the children of mixed marriage, but also children of mothors who were converted to liberal and Reform Judaism would not be Jews."[7] Thus the Problem facing "Jewish Nationalism" (i.e. Zionism), is a most strange nationalism. That is to say, even if Zionism bases its argument of the creation of Israel on religion, then such an interpretation, among other things, would fail to support the concept of alleged "Jewish Nationalism" (or Zionism), since the common bond of a religion does not necessarily create a common national bond especially in its strict modern meaning. And further, many Jews who are disseminated in many countries do not feel that the Israeli national flag is theirs.[8] If, on the other hand, Jewish nationalism is interpreted through the biological and blood line, there the dilemma appears again of proving the outworn and fallacious racial line which receives no recognition by modern anthropologists.

Another unique character of the State of Israel is its mystique "homeland". And here, indeed, the reader is confronted with a strange happening manifested in a group, an organized group, rising up all of a sudden, building a case, and imposing itself on a land, with all sorts of pressures including the force of arms, and expelling a well identified population, at the very same land long before any new claimant; in order to successfully put its "grand design" into operation.

Zionism has claimed Palestine as a "homeland for its alleged nation for no better reason than that of the Hebrews —whose relation to the Jews of the 19th and 20th Centuries Zionists seldom

care to define or explain— had had some association with Palestine about 2,000 years ago...".[9] "In its 6,000 years of history, Palestine has had associations with countless tribes and ethnic groups; that the association of the Hebrews with Palestine lasted some 1,500 years; that association which had come to an end some eighteen centuries before the rise of Zionism — was not continuous, but intermittent... and that at no time... did the Hebrews inhabit all of Palestine, or constitute the sole inhabitants of that land."[10]

Here, the Zionist dilemma becomes even more complicated. How can one associate ethnically the Zionists with the Hebrews whose association with Palestine was ended 18 centuries before the rise of Zionism? Even if this premise could be proven, how can a limited, part-time and interrupted association of people to a land, enable those people to claim the entire land? The creation of Israel in Palestine, accordingly, can not be considered other than a violation of modern standards and principles of international law and practice.

One of the worst things man in the 20th Century has witnessed is the creation of a State by usurping another people's land, to make those people flee and become displaced; then to have its issue forced upon The United Nations, through utmost support of a democratic nation.

The injustice which befell the Palestinian Arabs as a result of the creation of Israel, has aroused the conscience of man such as the world famous historian, Arnold Toynbee, who said before a mass gathering at McGill University in Montreal, Canada: "Israeli treatment of Arabs in 1947 was morally comparable to Nazi murders of six million Jews. — — — It was particularly tragic because the Jews suffered the same sort of thing at the hands of the Nazis. The most tragic thing in human life is when people who having suffered impose suffering in their turns".[11]

The Palestinian Arab refugess' tragedy is by all means an International tragedy. It is serious and dangerous. It has been in existence since 1948. Further delay makes it more dangerous; i.e., if such human tragedy is left unsolved, it may lead to an explosion

on a much wider scale. It is left for these reasons that this problem deserves concerted attention and concern.

How this problem entered the Ameriacn scene and how the United States Congress reacted to it, is the theme of this research.

---

1. "Historical examination,..... reveals that the creation of Israel is the result of Zionist planning and organized effort." See Alan R. Taylor: Prelude to Israel- an analysis of Zionist Diplomacy (1897-1947), the Philosophical Library, 1959, Preface P. VI.

2. United States Congress: Committee on Foreign Relations (86th Congress. 2nd session), Staff No. 13, **Middle East,** June 9, 1960, p. 34.

3. In 1920, the Jews numbered only 10 percent of the entire population. In 1947 they had increased to 22 jercent. Conversely, the Arabs in 1920 were 90 percent. In 1947 they became 67 percent. This resulted mainly from forceful ingathering of Jews from the various parts of the World, during the British mandate.

4. See statement made during the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly, by Ahmed Shukairy, head of Saudi Arabian Mission to the U.N. (Nov. 30, 1960), p. 57.

5. Fayez A. Sayegh, "The Encounter of Two Ideologies-Zionism and Arabism", in W. Sands, Ed., **The Arab Nation,** The Middle East Institute, 1960, p. 78.

6. 1. **Ibid.**

7. Quoted by Sayegh, from **Jewish Chronicles,** p. 79.

8. An outstanding article written on this line by Alfred Lilienthal which appeared in the Reader's Digest (Sept. 1949) and reprinted in the U.S. Congressional Record (1949), in which he said, "Israel's flag is not mine ..... this new flag has brought everyone of us 5,000,000 American citizens of the ancient faith of a loyal citizen of any country could adhere ..... By contrast, Zionism was and is a national movement organized to reconstitute a nation with a separate homeland". p. A5619.

9. Sayegh, **op. cit.** p. 81.

10. **Ibid.,** p. 81.

11. For further comments, see **Arab News and Views,** Vol. VII No. 4 p. 15, 5-March 1, 1961.

PART II

The Palestine issue did not enter American scene by accident. The entry of the Palestine issue upon the American scene, can be better understood through, first, the American system of Government; and second, outside forces working upon it. The theory of "Checks and Balances" in the American System of government permits great access for outside forces to influence both the Executive and Legislative branches. The principle of "Checks and Balances" with regard to Palestine in fact, helped outside forces tremendously: first in controling personalities, and later in making both powers — — the Executive and the Legislative — — boasting for the winning of the same outside force. We shall see later in this research how this outside force — the Zionist organization — managed to have access to both the Excetive and the Legislative branches. We shall also see how the control of Key personalities influenced congressional decisions, and later the Executive stand.

Under the American system of separation of powers, each of the three distinctive powers —Executive, Legislative and Judicial— can "check" the other branches so that a concentration of Power in one agency is prevented; and thus a balance of powers resultt. This means that the President, with regard to foreign affairs, is never completely free in making his decisions. Deniel Sheever and H. Field Haviland affirm in their book, *American Foreign Policy*

and the Separation of Powers, that "there can be little doubt that there are strong arguements in the substantiation of a theory of executive predominance in foreign relations, nevertheless, both the constitution and actual pratice make it clear that the President does not have sufficient authority to control foreign policy without regard to the wishes of the legislative branch. In many matters he has no choice but to work with congress. In fact, some writers support a theory of legislative predominance".[12] Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has correctly observed that in one "aspect of foreign affairs Congress is all powerful. This is in the establishing and maintaining of those fundamental policies, with their supporting of actions, which require legal authority, men and money. Without these foundations — solidly laid and kept in repaid — even wise and skillful diplomacy cannot provide the power and develop the world environment indispensable to national independence and individual liberty for ourselves and others."[13] Senator Hubert Humphrey indicates that parliamentary bodies do not govern and that the American Congress is no exception to this rule.[14] But it is also true that "with its power of the purse, and through the right to investigate, to critiscize and advocate, the Congress does exert significant influence on the quality and direction of the United States foreign policy, and it usually does so without violating the integrity of the Excutive Branch."[15] In Laski's view, "no legislative assembly in the World rivals the Senate... in its influence in the International sphere."[16]

Further, Congress unlike the Parliament in Britian, gives a "Central" position to the Committee system. This means that any standing committee is an expert body which by means of studies, investigations and hearings, can play a significant role in Congress. It recommends, and usually the Congress approves its recommendation. In short, actual power in Congress lies in Committees.[17] "And because of the importance of the chairman, the Committee is responsible only if the chairman is responsible."[18] This much shows us that the chairman of a standing Committee in Congress occupies a key position. And the position of committee Chairman

still remains significant despite the attempts made to limit his powers somewhat. What gives a key position to the Committee Chairman is that he is customarily accepted as the spokesman of his committee. Further, he has arbitrary power in calling meetings, controling discussions, selecting measures to be comsidered by the Committee and reporting to the full chamber.[19] But despite all these powers the chairman possesses, there is "little assurance that the chairman of a committee will be "responsible" at any meaningful sense."[20] Even the selection of a chairman is often done "on grounds... deterrent to genuine responsibility."[21] On the other hand, a vigorous chairman can exert a significant influence in Congress. His influence extends even to the executive branch, since a proposed bill by the President has to be studied and recommended by a committee first.

But the Chairmen of a Committee in Congress cannot work alone. He needs to exchange views with his colleagues before, and during sessions. In order to play an influencial role, he must know how to enlist the support of the active members of his committee. Thus, it is the influence of the chairman of a Committee together with those active colleagues that shape committee recommendations and resolutions.

The other significant feature of the nature and operation of Congress, aside from what we have already discussed, the "central" position of committees, is the great access given to "lobbying". In fact much of the agreements and discussions are made in lobbies. Lobbyists, as representative of interest groups usually exert pressure on legislators in order to make them respond to their demands.

The break-up of the United States Congress into committees and sub-committees puts lobbyists in an ideal situation, which is not without influence upon the entire work and decisions of Congress. One of the most noticeable observation is that lobbying, if it is ill used, can create and cause great damages to the entire country. Definite damage results, for example, when lobbyists possess greater deal of information on a particular issue,

and ill-use it on inadequately informed congressmen. Greater damage can be done when a small minority can influence decisions of Congress, and profit for itself at the expense of the entire nation. But nothing can de more harm than the coincidence of a congressman "personal motivation" with an interest group, and the resulting profit to both, at the expense of the public interest.

The most interesting fact about lobbying in the American system of government is that government agents in general and legislators in particular, due to the nature of the system among other things, do respond to "interest groups". This response, can only be understood in term of these interest groups' "access" and "maneuvering"; which at times causes the legislator to be threatened or feel he is threatened. Such feeling of threat generates usually from the modern techniques used by the various interest groups.

"Interest groups" or "pressure groups" as they are sometimes called, use whatever pressures they possess to make their views felt and achieve action. Basically, pressure is applied in two ways: direct and indirect. Direct pressure is the personal sort of pressure exercised by the group leader on officials. To obtain his goal, the interest group leader may use various techniques: He tries his personal pressure by using persuasion, technical information, threats of political reprisals, or promises of voting support.[22] No matter which technique is used, the object remains the same, and that is "to impress the groups' wishes forcibly on the decision making official(s)".[32] Indirect pressure, as the term implies, is the kind of pressure used by the interest group in two steps. The first step is to create (through editorial and news columns of the nations' newspapers and periodicals, radio and television, among others), a "mass opinion" "that will in turn exert pressure on officials to take the desired steps".[24] In a word, the creation of public opinion favorable to an interest group, is but the result of propaganda work. But in the final analysis, "the interest group comes nearest to com-

pletion when it is able to stir up the public to the point where policy — makers face an opinion "fait accompli" to which they have no choice but to bow".[25].

Political Zionism forms a typical interest group. Political Zionism has succeeded through various means in gathering many sympathizers and converted members of Congress. But as we penetrate into the secrecy of their success, we are convinced more and more that there exist within the legislative circle a lack of complete comprehension of Zionism. This very miscomprehension of the real intentions of Zionism on the part of a number of Congressmen, together with the distorted picture of the Arab affairs,[26] have greatly contributed to the Zionist success. On the other hand, the Zionist have adoritly exploited other means, for drawing American sympathy, such as that of humanitarian appeal, religious and historical attachments to Palestine, among others, which served them best.

Zionists' appeal to apparent "humanitarian" ground is all too false. It is nothing more than a political approach set up for sheer political gain. As already mentioned earlier, Zionists have no interest in human endeavors. Zionists organization was not formed to serve for charitable purposes; it was formed for the purpose of establishing a state in Palestine. In order to achieve this goal, the Zionists had to establish an articulate Zionist lobby in the American capital. Through their propaganda activity, "the Zionists have managed to frighten the politicians,"[27] they have managed to speak for the entire American Jewry; while in fact they represent only a segment of them.[28] "Though there is little evidence that a "Jewish Vote" exists or is deliverable to any party, or a particular candidate — — — yet the mythical unity attributed to "Jewish people" by Zionist propaganda caused the American politicians' surrender to Jewish Nationalism".[29]

The Zionist slogan about the Biblical rights of the Jews to Palestine is envisioned with favorable version. A true interpretation of the promise given to (Abraham and his seeds), would equally include the Arabs, Moslems and Christians who are the

descendants of Ibraham's eldest son, "Ishamel. But the more challenging question that arises before the Jews, of how much the newly converted Europeans and Americans to Judasism are related to the early Hebrews, has no answer. Thus, the Zionist demand that whoever embraces Judaism, should acquire the promised land, sounds not only strange, but ficticious.

To Biblical rights, Zionist added historical rights. Again, anyone who is free from Zionist pressure, does not need to go into all the historical details to find the answer. Suffice it to say, that the Arabs, who are the descendents of the "Canaanites" have a much stronger historical claim to Palestine. To all this must be added the other historical fact; that the Arabs have been the constant inhabitants of whole Palestine for the last 2000 years; whereas old Hebrews occupied part of Palestine and only for a limited period. Thus, if one follows the Zionists claim, Canada and the United States must be given to Red Indians, and so all the rest of world's map must make some changes.

Thus, "by wrapping the labels "humanitarian", "liberal" and "religious" around its political program, Zionism has carried the day. And conversely, people who have supported but one plank of a manyfaceted Zionist program, usually the "humanitarian", have wound up by being counted in the fold and have been exploited by Zionist nationalism".[30] Thus, Zionism stands on false foundations wrich must now be clear to the neutral observer. It is no exaggeration, then, to say that Zionism stands for political opportunism; and is far away from religious and humanitarian attributes. Further, this political opportuism cannot and should not be associated with democracy. For, if democracy rests upon agreement and approval of the governed for the governing, on the will of the majority, on the application of peaceful means to solve problems, on the belief in human rights, freedom, and human self-determination; Zionism, has managed to push forward through propaganda, threat, force, and by imposing itself on a country populated and inhabited by a ma-

jority of Arabs; thus causing them to flee and become in the end displaced and homeless.

---

12. Daniel S. Sheever and H. Field Haviland, **American Foreign Policy and the Separation of Powers,** Harvard University Press, 1952, p. 11.
13. Quoted by Senator Hubert Humphrey, "The Senate in Foreign Policy", in **Foreign Affairs** (July, 1959), p. 532.
14. **Ibid.,** p. 532.
15. **Ibid.,** p. 532.
15. Quoted by Sheever, **op. cit.** p. 12.
17. Robert Dahl, Congress and Foreign Policy, Yale Institute, of International Studies, New Haven 1949, p. 9.
18. **Ibid.,**
19. **Ibid.,** p. 10.
20. **Ibid.,** p. 9.
21. **Ibid.,** p. 9.
22. Charles O. Lerche, Jr. - **Foreign Policy of the American People,** Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1958, p. 63.
23. **Ibid.,** p. 63.
24. **Ibid.,** p. 64.
25. **Ibid.,** p. 64.
26. To cite only one example, see **U.S. Congressional Record** (March 12, 1962) p. 3495, where representative steed confuses between Oil, Arab Nationalism and Iranian Nationalism. More astonishing of all, is that the wrong was left without correction.

PART III

The American system has given way to Zionism and Zionists' pressure. This pressure which successfully came to fruition in 1948 in the creation of the State of Israel, and later ensured its support and protection, dates back to the world war I period. Contrary to the general belief, the American pro-Zionist stand in Palestine, was not solely the decision of the President; it was a decision supported, upheld, and esteemed, first by Congress. Zionist pressure was felt in Congress as early as the Belfour Declaration of November 2, 1917. And it was in 1922, when the Zionists succeeded in pressing for the "Lodge Resolution", favoring the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. It was a joint resolution by the Two-Houses of Congress. In his address to the sixty-seventh Congress, on June 30, 1922, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the prime mover of the resolution, revealed his sympathy for the Jewish people and urged the Congress to pass a reslution on the pretext that it "neither threaten nor invades any rights of any other people".[31] (No doubt the fact that the great majority of Arabs numbered 90% in Palestine was not known to Senator Henry C. Lodge at the time). In the very same address, Senator Lodge was only able to accept religious tolerance for the Jews, but also never to "accept in Palestine the thought that Jerusalem and Palestine should be under the control of the Mohammedans".[32]

This move by senator Lodge was not without foundation. Louis Lipsky, representing the Zionist Organization of America, in his testemony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Wednesday, February 16, 1944, as one of the survivors of the hearings of 1922, before the very same House Committee, clearly indicated that "acrimonious debates that took place" at the time, but with the result that the end was accepted by a good number of Senators and Representatives whose views were not only in full support of the American Zionist Organization but also were given wide circulation in a book published by the Zionists entitled, "The War, Congress and Zionism".33. Lipsky confirmed that the Zionists views were received with support and endorsement by President Harding, who signed the said resolution in less than two years[34]. Strange as it may sound, the records of both 1922 and 1944 hearings showed all too clearly that the Jews themselves, the majority of the Jews still indifferent to the Jewish National Home in Palestine. [35] In other words, only a well organized minority of the Jewish people, the Zionist Organization, was advocating a National Home in Palestine.

The Joint Congressional resolution of 1922, was regarded by the Zionist only as an initial success. But in the meantime it was seeking further response and support for the years to come. The right moment for the second campaign on Congress, came, only few years later, when the Zionists were able to push for the creation of the American Palestine Committee. The creation of the American Palestine Committee was not without fruition: it soon secured an enrollment of (67) Senators and (143) Representatives, which was substantial success.[36] Thus by "December 1942, Congress again demonstrated its susceptibility to Zionist propaganda when one third of the Senate joined one and a half thousand other public figures in signing a revisionist proclamation demanding the creation of a Jewish Army".[37].

"What was needed now was a Congressional declaration backing the (Zionist) Biltmore program. On October 6, 1943, a group of 500 rabbis arrived at the Capitol and presented the Zio-

nist demands to Vice-President Wallace".[38] At this time the Zionist lobbyists stood on the march: Many Zionist representatives were instructed to make supplementary maneuverings to frustrate any anti-Zionist reaction[39]. The object of this whole episode was to seek a Congressional resolution, or rather action to be taken urging Great Britain to abrogate the Malcolm Macdonald white paper of 1939, since it limited Jewish immigration into Palestine to (75,000) with all Jewish immigration to cease on March 31, 1944[40]. Instead, the Zionists wanted to "reestablish Palestine as a home for the Jews, in accordance with the principle laid down by the famous Balfour Declaration of 1917"[41]. The first response of the new dramatic campaign on Congress resulted in Congressmen's position to the President, urging action. In the words of a member of the House of Representatives, Emanuel Celler, "upon Britains announcement of its change of Policy, as contained in the White paper, President Roosevelt was asked to take action in protest by a petition signed by (51) Senators, (194) Representatives, and (30) Governors. The President expressed his sympathy and promised to do all in his power to prevent curtailment of Jewish immigration to Palestine".[42] But the British White Paper of 1939, caused in the Zionist circles suspicions of future British intentions. The Zionists saw that it was urgently needed to transfer their headquarter to the United States. And this was what they did in 1940. Now, that the headquarter became close to the American Branch, Zionists' power and tactics not only were doubled but also became more fruitful. It was to these new tactics that caused the (500) Zionist Rabbis to assemble in a petition to Congress urging it to pass a resolution expressing the Legislative Branch, suport for continuous Jewish immigration in the hope that they eventually become sufficient and powerful to establish their "promised" home in Palestine.

The resolution demanded by the Zionists did not meet any hardship in Congress. But the amazing thing about the proposed resolution, was the questionaire between the chairman of the House of Committee on Foreign Affairs, Sol Bloom, and Charles

A. Eaton, Representative from New Jersey, and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When Congressman Eaton asked the Chairman who wrote the resolution and prepared it, the Chairman connived its authorship as if he did not know how it happened.[43] But the story of the handling of the proposed resolution, on the other hand, was no less vivid than its authorship. At the outset, it revealed a climatic success for Zionism: a success with the two Houses, but particularly overwhelming with the lower House. "When the resolution was introduced into that body, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Chairman of which was Sol Bloom, a representative from New York and a Zionist".[44] And "when the House Hearings got underway, Sol Bloom presented the members of the Committee with a pamphlet he had prepared for the purpose of instructing them on all relevant matters connected with the resolution. Actually, however, the booklet was primarily devoted to summarizing the Zionist position on Palestine".[45] A more interesting thing yet to come was the fact that the booklet under discussion did not include any reference from the State Department, "which is not short of surprising since the resolution up for consideration involved a significant development in American Foreign Policy, the handling of which is specifically assigned to the State Department by the President".[46] All of this took place at the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Hearings, but no one of the members seemed, as one read the volume of (504) plus a supplement of (104) pages of Hearings to object or question the authenticity or objectivity of the wordings such as "the White paper sets up another but illegal, amoral Standard".[47] Or the statements made by a Zionist member and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hamilton Fish, from New York and co-author of the "Lodge Resolution", who in the midst of his speech, boasted "I hope that the Zionists all over the World will not yield to this proposed breach of Trust in order to cajole the Arabs by double-crossing the Jewish people in Palestine and elsewhere and selling them out for a mass of Porridge... I urge the President, the State

Department, and the Congress to demand that there shall be no modification of our treaty rights in Palestine without our consent".[48] Or, Abba Hillal Silver, then the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Zionist emergency Council, testifying before the Committee on Foreign Affairs said indiscreetly to Chairman Bloom, "you know what we think of you", notwithstanding that "we" meant the "Zionists". Indeed one is forced to notice the Zionists' huge demonstration in Congress. Also to notice how significant the role played by Bloom, "to employ his position as chairman of the Committee to guide the discussion in such a way as to avoid embarrassement to Zionism".[49]

Zionsist tactics remained constant in Congress. By January 27, 1944, they were able to push through both houses a joint resolution in favor of their claims to Palestine. The resolution affirmed that "the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into the Country, and that there shall be full opportunity for Colonization, so that these Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth".[50] As the Zionists sought to have the resolution receive Presidental endorsement, they were confronted, this time by the disapproval of the Chief of the Staff, General Marshall. General Marshal objected that such step be taken on the ground that it inflicts upon Allies, at the time, a disadvantage. But the Key Zionist Representative, relentlesaly, kept pushing for the President's endorsment. The repeated pressure was confronted by reluctance from the State Department. Notwithstanding any unexpected consequences, Emanual Celler, a pro-Zionist Congressman from New York, and Key figure, "threatened the President with a congressional investigation if actions were not taken to prevent the State Department from continuing its opposition to Zionism".[51] Despite all the more pressure, and inspite of Weizman's suggestion to the U.S. British strong stand in letting down any Arab objection, Presi-

dent Roosevelt maintained his stand that Arabs concent should be sought. It was not until Truman's Administration that a loophole for the Zionists was found.

Truman's support of Zionism, paved the better way along with key members of the Legislative Branch, who had already expressed sympathy to the Zionist cause, for the "final push" in the United Nations. But before the vital hour came to decide finally the issue of Palestine, the Zionists already accumulated sufficient power to importune their Congressmen that their premier aim was not one that concerned with the European displaced Jews, and finding a way for their settlement in America and other European countries, but their aim concerned the creation of a Zionist State in Palestine. By now, Congressmen and other important figures in the American government knew that the Zionists were not at all for humanitarian endeavor. Nevertheless, their test of muscles, one year before the final shooting in the United Nations, the Congressional election year of 1946, showed great enthusiasm for the Zionist cause. "It was reported that Dewey was considering the advisibility of making a statement favoring Zionism. Mead, Lehman, who were running on the Democratic ticket for Senator and Governor, respectively proceeded to press Truman for a smiliar proclamation on behalf of the Democratic Party. The result of this was a statement by Truman calling once again for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine and thus the adminstration, as well as both parties became further committed to the support of Zionism".[52]

The Zionist show in the United Nations was spectacular. All the political movement's machinery was set to work. It was a full scale operation to win the United Nations for the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine. The American delegation at the United Nations, notwithstanding the attention of all Nations of the World, were busy working on hesitant states, such as Haiti, Liberia, the Phillipines, Greece, China and Ethiopia, to vote pro-Zionist. During the decisive hours of November 22, 1947, it was to the dismay o fthe Zionists to learn that lese than the

"required number of votes were pledged to support partition".[53] The immediate instructions required to press harder on the pledge Congressmen to contact the Executive government officials to get the needed votes.

The final answer came revealing the establishment of the Zionist State in Palestine; but it was not only un-democratic, but also outrageous. The extreme pressure focused on the State Department made Robert Lovett, the Under Secretary of State declare that "he had never in his life been subject to as much pressure as he had ben (during the final stage of the voting).[54] Evn Former President Truman, who gave, after eleven minutes of voting in the United Nations, a De facto recognition for the Zionist fabricated State, confessed in his "Memories" answering Weizman, the Zionist leader, that, "the facts were that not only were the pressure movements around the United Nations unlike anything that h had been seen before but that the White House, too, was subjected to a constant barrage: "I do not think I ever had as much pressure and propaganda aimed at the White House as I had in this instance. The persistence of a few of the extreme Zionist leaders-actuated by political motive and engaging in political threats-disturbed and annoyed me".[55]

---

27. A. Lilienthal, **What Price Israel,** 1953, p. 109.

28. "A maximum of ten percent, of American Jews are Zionists party members, while a bare half of one percent, are anti-Zionists, the rest are non-Zionists ....." see A. Lilienthal, - **There Goes the Middle East,** p. 209.

29. What Price, **op. cit.,** p. 109.

30. There Goes the Middle East **op. cit.** p. 206.

31. **U.S. Congress-House:** Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs (78th Cong. 2nd session) **"The Jewish National Home in Palestine",** Senator Henry Cabot Lodge address, June 30, 1922, referred to in Hearngs (Feb. 8, 9, 15 and 16, 1944). p. 375.

32. **Ibid.,** p. 375.

33. **Ibid.,** p. 376.

34. **Ibid.,** p. 376.

35. **Ibid.,** p. 376.

36. Alan R. Taylor, **Prelude to Israel:** an analysis of Zionist Diplomacy (1897-1947), the Philosophical Library, 1959, p. 81

37. **Ibid.,** see also Goerge Kirk: Middle East in the War, p. 247

38. Ibid., p. 81 - also Frank Charles Sakran, **Palestine Dilemma.** Arab Rights

vs. Zionist Aspiration, Wash. D.C. public Affairs.
39. **Ibid.**
40. U.S. Congressional Hearings, **op. cit.,** p. 12
41. **Ibid.**
42. U.S. Congress, Hearing, **op. cit.,** p. 13
43. Seventy-Eight U.S. Congress, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearings, **op. cit., pp.** 2-3
44. Taylor, **op. cit.,** p. 82
45. **Ibid.**
46. **Ibid.**
47. Hearings, **op. cit.,** p. 14
48. **Ibid.,** p. 18
49. Taylor, **op. cit.,** p. 83
50. Hearings, **op. cit.,** p. 391
51. Taylor, **op. cit.,** p. 86; also Kirk, **op. cit.,** p. 314
52. **Ibid.,** p. 93
53. **Ibid.,** p. 103
54. **Ibid.,** p. 103
55. Truman, "Memoires" p. 158

PART IV

The forced creation of a Zionist State in Palestine was not without severe consequences: the ousting of one million Arab refugees. Few stopped and looked with insight to what a forced state will create in the Arab World. Ironically enough some members in the Congress did not pay any attention to the fact that Palestine was a predominately Arab populated area. They dealt with Palestine as if it were vacant, more or less as an internal issue. Certain other responsible congressmen took issue, for rivalry with their competitors. The huge dissiminated Zionist propaganda blocked off, to still other Congressmen, the completed true picture. The rest were confused, and did not know what to do other than follow the tide of the day. One is amazed at the huge pile of speeches and comments found in the Congressional Record; favoring the bolstering of the State of Israel. On the first anniversary celebration of the State of Israel, Henry Cabot Lodge Jr.[56] was among the first of American government officials to give a celebrating speech. Before he opened his speech, Lodge was introduced to the audience by Rabbi Hillal Silver in the following words, "A generation ago dear friends, a name was written large in the annals of the Zionist Movement, that name was that of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. It was under his leadership, and by his political guidance and sagacity, that the first revolution favoring the establishment of the Jewish National

Home in Palestine was adopted by the Congress of the U.S. in 1922... (The Speaker) name is now being written large in the annals of the American Zionist Movement, alongside of his distinguished grandfather".[57] Although, Lodge knows well that it is the people, the majority of the people, under democracy, to determine and decide what is good for the people, nevertheless, he concluded his speech with: "What has happened in Israel is not only good for the Jews and good fo rthe people of the Near East and good for the United States, it is in all truth good for the whole human race...".[59] Apparently, Lodge, did not mind seeing one million of the human race become displaced and dissipated, so long as it was satisfying the Zionists.

Again and despite the fact that Palestine house was set fire by all the forceful means aplied by the Zionists, Congressman Emanuel Celler insisted in the House of Representative on September 22, 1949, that "We (in Congress) must keep this clearly in mind: The Israelis did not drive these Arabs out of Palestine. In truth and in fact, the Israelis urged them to stay".[60] One need not refer to the successive United Nations resolutions concerning the rights of Arabs to return home; but merely refer to what the Zionist sources themselves confessed about one of their massacres in Deir Yassin. This is what Hal Lehrman sain in *Commentary*, "Native fear of more Deir Yassine must be added to all other reasons for the mad flight of the Arab people. I am shaken by the expressions of grief and shame that I have privately received from non-political but prominent Israelis, whose personal integrity is beyond question. The Israeli soldier has looted, burned and slaughtered, I have been told, and it is no comfort for us that soldiers of every army do likewise. It is even hinted that certain officers actually ordered their trops to let themselves go...".[61] Probably, President John Kennedy, then a Representative and later a Senator, did not read about the Deir Yassin massacre, when he made his address at Yankee Stadium on the occasion of the the eighth anniversary of Israel saying "Yes: Israel, We salute You. We know your progress and your determination and

your spirit ... all the nations of the World, in the Middle East and elsewhere, realized that Israel here to stay ... she will not surrender, she will not retreat ... and we will not let her fall".[62] Nor did Congressman John D. Dingell in the House of Representatives on March 22, 1956, understand the real intention of Israel's future military campaigns, or else was sympathetic to them when he said, 'Time is very short, the Secretary of State must make a strong statement of policy that we tolerate no changes in the status quo. We must ship to Israel the arms she needs without delay. America must recognize its responsibility to preserve a foothold of democracy in a hostile feudal land".[63]

Only few months after this favorable and constant bolstering of the State of Israel, came the blow of the Israeli-Angle-Franco attack on Egypt (U.A.R.). Now, it was needless to prove that Israel, backed by Britain and France, by opening military attack, envisioned territorial expansion over the neighboring Arab States. As Campbell has correctly put it: "after Israel's attack on Egypt and her obvious reluctance to withdraw from Sinia and Gaza, who can say that this fear (of Arabs) is without reality of without justifications".[64]

Seen from all perspectives, the role played by Congress, in the emergence and constant support and protection of Israel has been great indeed; but this role, on the other hand, has worsened Arab-American relations. It has ignored the wishes of the great majority in Palestine. This attitude which ignored the principle of people's self-determination, makes it both undemocratic and also contrary to American Ideals.

Praise of Israel by the Congress has remained constant. It is no exaggeration to say that Israel with less than two millions has overshadowed all Arab relations. Economic wise, total governmental aid alone for the State of Israel between 1948-1955 as an example "was greater than that given to all Arab States combined in the same period. These amounts have been suplemented by a substantially larger amounts of private assistance to Israel from American Jews"[65]. Publicity wise, rarely a week passed without

some remarks made either by Congressmen, Senators, or other high officials over the press, the Radio and Television and other means of communications: all boasting for Israel. Almost always the remarks on Arab countries are mentioned not for the purpose of indicating progress of any sort, but to make contrast: Israel makes progress and the Arabs are standing still. Direct and indirect discussions usually take Israel's side. In the voluminous literature of the "U.S. Congressional Record" rarely is there a rebuttle by a Congressman presenting the Arab point of view. And even on rare occasions, the Arab point of view is only mentioned indirectly.

When Congressman Victor Anfuso was at the House of Representatives hailing Israel on its 12th anniversary on April 21, 1960, he not only praised Israel but also denied that she was embarking on "any expansionist adventure as is falsely maintained in certain Arab quarters...[66]. In the meantime, he expressed pleasure at the House aproval of the amendment assuring freedom of navigation in international waterways. He deplored the situation whereby "their blindness, the Arab leaders refuse to recognize fatcs or to consider reason", and hailed the Seafarers Union for performing a great service to the free world "in teaching the Egyptian dictator a lesson in American democracy"[67]. No doubt these remarks represent definite pro-Zionist stand. But where Senator J.W. Fullbright wanted to refer to the activities of the Zionist interest group in Congress, he referred to it only by saying "our representative government is designed to deal with these special interests, to balance them, and ultimately blend conflicting interests in such a way that the total national interest will be served... there are limits, however, beyond which special interests can't go without under running the conduct of our foreign policies[63]. The gist of Senator Fulbright's statement is that the Zionists over-pressure on American policy makers in the Middle East is endangering the national interests of America.

56. A Senator, aid later the chief of American Delegation to the United Nations in the early days of Israel emergence.

57. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., played a big role defending the Zionist cause in the U. N. — See for the above the U.S. Congressional Record (1949) p. A 2806
57. **Ibid.**
59. **Ibid.**
60. **Ibid.,** p. A 5821
61. Hal Lehrman, "The Arabs of Israel", **Commentary,** (Dec. 19, 1949)
63. **Ibid.,** (1956) p. A2569
64. John C. Campbell: **Defense of the Middle East.** p. 317
65. S. Shepard Jones: **American's Roles in the Middle East,** Foreign Relations Series, Laid Law Brothers publishers, River Forest, Illinois, 1961, p. 41
66. U.S. Congressional Record (86th Cong. 2nd Session), April 22, 1960.
67. Ibid., (April 22, 1960)
68. Ibid., (April 29, 1960)

PART V

Israel's imposition has created a refugee problem for over one million Palestinian Arabs. This problem in effect has greatly contributed to the existing social, economic and political difficulties of adjacent Arab countries. More than that, it has not only deprived the Palestinian Arabs of their elemental rights of security, peace, and freedom, but also has displaced them from their own Country. The creation of Israel, in a word has made the Palestinians "a source of danger and instability in the countries in which they reside, and will serve as fertile soil for subversion and unrest"[69].

The Arab refugees have entered their sixteenth year living in camps under the threat of hunger, diseases, and death. According to the United Nations record, the number of Arab refugees registered with the Relief Agency until the end of June 1960 has reached 1,120,889 persons[70]. These refugees are maintained by the United Nations. Their diet is far "below the minimum required for an individual and consists of basic food stuffs, with no meat, vegetable or fruit. The 1500 calories which a refugee receives from the U.N. cost less than seventeen cents per day, per person, including administrative and other expenses".[71] The U.N. Record also reveals that the annual total cost of the refugees until June 30, 1960, was $35,004,000.00. Of this $26,763,000.00 went toward rations and $8,241,000.00 to cover vocational and

educational expenses as well as individual projects[12].

Careful analysis shows that the Arab refugee problem has been distorted and mutilated. The Zionists have relentlessly dissiminated, through their headquarter, in the United States, information favoring only the interests of Israel and Zionism. Zionist dissimination of erroneous informations are not without planning. Of these plans, first comes the idea, that the refugees' flight was not the mistake of Israel, but that of the Arab States, or rather the Arab League; thus the two issues (Israel — and Arab refugees) should not be mingled together. And since the regugee problem was the mistake of the Arabs, it is logical, according to the Zionist logic, that the Arab States should collectively solve their problem. Why the refugee problem has remained so long, the Zionists assert, is because of Arab States indifference and carelessness, on the one hand, and because the refugees are used as political ammunition against Israel on the other. Therefore, Israel can't be responsible for the consequences of the refugees' problem. Nor can it be asked to let them return, since non of them wish to live in a new society which is very different from their own. All the fuss about refugees' return is but the fabrication of Arab States.

As one goes deep into the core of the Arab refugee problem, he will find that what is presented by the Zionists does not represent the refugees' true picture For any thoughtful analysis, will disregard the Zionist fabricated information. The Arab refugee problem is self-explanatory. It is a fact, a material fact and does not require any imagination. One does not need even to take the trouble of reading the Zionist literature since it is easy to discover it was designed for internal consumption; i.e., to secure financial and political support, both from the American public and American officials — to keep Israel alive. And this is, indeed a remaining task for Zionism, which by itself explains why Zionist organization has continued to exist despite the fulfillment of its aim: the creation of Zionist state in Palestine. In other words, Zionism's remaining task includes both the dissimination

of "favorable news" to Israel's survival and the liquidation of the "diasopora". It would be fruitless, therefore, to assume, in the light of the above that the Zionists recognize the reality of Arab refugee problem.

The pretext presented by the Zionists and their supporters does not stand on real grounds. That the Arab League is responsible for the refugees flee is another way of saying that the Arabs ousted the Arabs to establish a Zionist state. It was the periodic attacks which were carried out by the Zionist forces that made the Palestine Arabs flee. Those inhuman incidents, after they entered the record of history are no secret. The incident on the night of January 4, 1948, at the Kataman Quarter of Jerusalem where the Semiramis Hotel was blown up killing many including the Spanish Consul General; and the Dier Yassin incident whose news shocked the World for its brutality, are only examples of the many Zionist massacres[73]. In the words of Dr. John H. Davis, the United Nations Relief and works Agency Director, in answering the charge that the Arab host governments have mistreated the refugees by neglecting them and even holding them as hostages in their struggle with Israel, he says, "The truth is that in general the (Arab) host governments have been sympathetic and generous within their means".[74] As to the charge that the Arab politicians have held the refugees idle, Dr. Davis replies that Arab politicians "quite accurately voice the deep feelings and aspirations"[75] of their peoples in not accepting Israel in the heart of their land and against their will. And when it comes to the charge that the Arab refugees do not want to return to their home in Palestine, Mr. Henry R. Labouisse, Former Director of UNRWA, declares that "the refugees as a whole insist upon the choice provided for them in General Assembly Resolution — 194 — that is, repatriation or compensation. In absence of that choice, they bitterly oppose anything which has even the semblance of Permanent settlement elsewhere".[76]

Against all these facts, the Zionists are still pushing on Con-

gress and the President to press Arab governments to take refugees into their respective countries, insist upon sitting down and talking peace (with no change of the status quo)[77] despite Israel's violation and expansion beyond U.N. plan; and in the meantime pushing the American Congress not to stop or curtail America's share of the refugee finance, in the hope that the passing of years may weaken and finally kill the issue. It is strange to see that the Zionist pressure has succeeded in influencing the course of America with regards to the Palestinian refugees up to present time by letting the Zionists have what they want and leave the refugees in camps homeless, without at least pressing Israel to enforce the United Nations decisions; despite the knowledge that the Zionist view on refugees constitutes a principal obstacle to settlement.

That is the reason why, then, a recent staff study prepared for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has recommended, a possible solution in which it says, "although the refugees insist on the right to return to their homeland, it is generally believed that relatively few of them — probably less than 10 percent would exercise that right",[78] in the hope that such recommendation will raise no objection by Israel supporters in Congress. But when a hearing was conducted by Mr. Cottam, of the State Department, before the House Committee on Appropriation, in July, 1961, Congressman John J. Rooney, commented on the proposal of enforcing the United Nation resolution on the refugees choice between repatriation and compensation by saying, "This proposal might be the end of the state of Israel ... you would recommend that these million Palestinian refugees should have the right of repatriation, and destroy all that has been done so far, all that has been by the American tax payers out of government funds, and by private people in America who contributed momentarily to the success of the State of Israel".[79].

Nothing can conclude the Arab refugee problem better than the following Zionist confession :

"In the last analysis the bare facts which strikes our eyes —

Here was a people who lived on its own land for 1,300 years. We came and turned the native Arabs into tragic refugees. And still we dare to slander and malign them, to besmirch their name. Instead of being deeply ashamed of what we did and trying to undo some of the evil we committed by helping these unfortunate refugees, we justify our terrible acts and even attempt to glorify them".[80].

What can the United States government do about this deteriorated situation will be discussed in the final part of this research: the conclusion.

---

69. Sami Haddawi: Palestine - Questions and Answers, 1961, p. 59
70. **Ibid.,** p. 38
71. **Ibid.,** p. 39
72. **Ibid.,** p. 40
73. See Jon Kimche, The Seven Fallen Pillers: The Middle East 1942—52 (New York, Praeger, 1953), P. 228; also A. Toynbee **Study of History:** Vol. VIII, p. 290
74. **Palestine Refugees Today,** (UNRWA Newsletter, Feb. 1961, New York U.N. Headquarters) p.p. 4—5
75. **Ibid.**
76. U.N. Press Release 3369, Feb. 11, 1957
77. The latest of such pushing was Representative Dodd proposed resolution to Congress made in a speech on March 20, 1962, in which he urges that the United States uses its good offices to push on Arabs States for Israel recognition. See U.S. **congressional Record,** March 20, 1962, p. 4182.
78. **U.S. Congress** (86 Congress. 2nd session) Committee on Foreign Relations Staff study No. 13, June 9, 1960, p. 38
79. **U.S. Congress** — House Committee on Appropriation: Hearings before the sub-committee of (87th Cong. 1st session), p. 691
80. See Nathan Chofshi — a member of the first Zionist group, who immigrated to Palestine, in 1906 and who is still living there —" "The Bitter Truth about the Arab Refugees," Jewish Newsletter, (Feb. 9, 1959)

PART VI

The role played by the United States in the creation of Israel is undoubtedly great. This big role was but the result of the work of a strong minority interest group: The Zionist Organization. It was not the Executive Branch which reciprocated first to the Zionists, rather the Legislative branch, the Congress, that escorted the initial pressure, but the culmination of which resided with the Executive branch, whose role already influenced by Congress became most articulate in the end.

In limiting itself to the role of Congress and its influence in shaping the American stand toward Palestine and the creation of Israel, this research, in following through the sequence of events, arrived at some interesting findings: that presure on Congress by a well organized group, the Zionist, goes back to the World I period. That Congress responded more actively to the Zionist pressure than the Executive. And that the connected series of influences finally made Congress, through its active pro-Zionist members occupying key position take the initiative to make the President follow a course of action favorable to progress of the Zionist claims in Palestine.

Several factors have worked on Congress for the success of Zionist design. The nature of the principle of separation of powers in the American Federal system allowing a dissipation of power, has let the legislative branch play a greater role than any

other system in Foreign Affairs. The increase of American responsibilities has even made the legislative branch go much beyond its traditional limits. But if this nature of the system of separation of powers allows the legislative branch to play a greater role in foreign Affairs, the internal structure of this same branch, being decentralized, has allowed, through the Committee system and the Key personalities still greater access, to pressure groups, to influence and interfere with its course of action.

The Zionists have taken advantage of all of these gaps. Through their control on the news media, the limited knowledge of a number of Congressmen of Arab affairs, together with the liberal interpretations of the Holy scriptures the Zionists have made their issue bear fruit.

If the Zionist campaign has succeeded materially, it failed both from the spiritual and justice angles. The killing, the massacring, the displacement of over one million Arab, could not be labeled other than criminal actions. More than that, it is degenerate to see massacres done against a suffering people; also to their revenge directed against an innocent and different people. Then to see, after all this, the same group that massacred others, helped and protected by a democratic government: the United States. "The Arabs until the establishment of Israel had considered the United States the one foreign power on which they could rely and who had in American confidence which they could give to no other foreigner, became alienated by what they considered ... breach of faith".

The United States government's support of Israel has worked against the American majority's security and interest. While America's interest and security need more than at any other period, a stable Middle East, the emergence of Israel, has caused much of its instability for the last sixteen years; thus threatening all American interests in the entire region. Furthermore, the American support and protection of Israel has severed American-Arab relations. The Arabs, the traditional allies of the West, have, since the establishment of Israel, pulled away from

the West to the neutral camp, in the West-East conflict. Needless to say that the Arabs withdrawal from the West has caused considerable headaches to America.

What can America do to restore faith? Nothing more than enforcing peace with justice. Israel whose very existence still depends on the American moral and financial aid, governmental and private, gives the United States a unique position to break the deadlock—correct wrongs by pressing on Israel to restore things to normal: The Eisenhower policy stand of November 1956 — March 1957 on the question of Israel's withdrawal from Gaza demonstrated good evidence of the United States' ability to influence the outcome of the present conflict.

How can things, in their broad meaning, be restored to normal? To this, no one has given a better answer than the eminent scholar Arnold Toynbee:

> "In seeking for terms on which a peace settlement might be arrived at, we ought to be guided all the time by three principles. The first of these is justice: The vindication of people's rights, and the righting of their wrongs. The second is humanity: the least possible suffering for the smallest possible number of people. The third is freedom of choice: the greatest possible number of options for people whose lives and rights will be affected by a peace settlement".

REFERENCES

Books

Buck, Ph. — *The Control of Foreign Relations in Modern Nations*, N.Y., Norton Co., 1957

Caroll, H. — *The House of Representatives and Foreign Affairs*, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958

Cohen, I. — *A Short History of Zionism*, London, Frederich Muller, Ltd., 1951

Dahl, R. — *Congress and Foreign Policy*, New Heaven, Yale Institute of Int. Studies, 1949

Gallaway, G. — *The Legislative Process in Congress*, New York, Corwell, 1961

Goldman, N. — *The Genius of Herzal and Zionism Today*, Jerusalem: Zionist Executive, 1955

Griffith, E. — *Congress — Its Contemporary Role*, New York University Press, N.Y. 1961

Haddawi, S. — *Palestine*: Questions and Answers, New York, Arab Information Center, 1961

Halperin, S. — *The Political World of Zionism*, Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1961

Hurewitz, J. — *The Struggle for Palestine*, New York, Norton Co., 1950

Lerche, Ch. — *Foreign Policy of the American People*, Prentice-Hall, N.J. 1958

Lilienthal, A. — *What Price Israel*, Chicago, Regnery, 1953

Lilienthal, A. — *There Goes The Middle East*, NY., Dewin-Adair, 1957

Sands, W. Ed. — *The Arab Nation*: Paths and Obstacles to Fulfillment, Washington, M.E. Institute, 1960

Taylor, A. — *Prelude to Israel*: An Analysis to Zionist Diplomacy, The Philosophical Library, 1959

Documents

U.S. Congress — Senate: Committee on Foreign Relations: The M.E. and Southern Europe; Report of H. Humphrey on a *study mission*, Washington, U.S. Gov't Printing Off., 1957

U.S. Congress — Senate: Committee on Foreign Relations: *Resolution of Palestine as a home land for the Jewish People*, Washington, U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1945.

U.S. Congress — Senate: Committee on Foreign Relations: *Situation in the Middle East*, Washington, U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1956.

U.S. Congress — Senate: Committee on Foreign Relations: *Hearings* by Hans Morgenthou, April 15, 1959.

U.S. Congress — House: *Hearings* before Sub-Committee on Appropriations (97th Congress, 1st session), Washington Gov't Printing Office, 1961.

U.S. Congress — House: Committee on Foreign Affairs: *The Jewish National Home in Palestine* (78th Congress — 2nd session), Washington, Gov't Printing Office, 1944.

U.S. Congress — Senate: Committee on Foreign Relations: *U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, No. 13, Washington, Gov't Printing Office, 1960.

U.S. Congress — House: Committee on Foreign Affairs: *Hearings* (81st Congress — 2nd session), Washington, Gov't Printing Office, February 16 and 17, 1950.

U. S. *Congressional Record* (September 22, 1949)

U.S. *Congressional Record* (May 7, 1956'

U.S. *Congressional Record* (May 23, 1956)

U.S. Congressional Record (March 22, 1956)

U.S. *Congressional Record* (March 12, 1962)

U.S. *Congressional Record* (March 20, 1962)

Pamphlets and Periodicals

Badeau, J.	"Advice to a Traveller", *Issues* (summer, 1960).
Chofshi, N.	"The Bitter Truth About The Arab Refugees", *Jewish Newsletter* (Feb. 9, 1959).
Humphrey, H.	"The Senate in Foreign Policy", *Foreign Affairs* (July, 19593).
Jones, S.	"*America's Role in the Middle East*" *Foreign Relations Series*, Laidlaw Brothers, River Forest, I11., 1961.
Peretz, D.	"*Israel and Palestinian Arabs*" *Middle East Inst.*, 1958.
Roosevelt, K.	"The Partition of Palestine", *Middle East Journal* (January, 1948).
Time Mag.	(August 26, 1957).
Hoynbee, A.	"Pioneer Destiny of Judaism", *Issues* (Summer, 1960).
Weizman, Ch.	"Palestine Role in the Solution of the Jewish Problem" *Foreign Affairs* (Jan., 1942).

The Series of Foreign Languages books

allready published:

1. The Foundations of Arabic-Islamic political thought.

   by,

   Dr. Fadhil Zaki Mohammed

2. IRAQ, geographic study, social and economic Developpement.

   by,

   Dr. M.R. Al, Feel
   Ph. D., F.R.G.S.

3. Sixth Anniversary of July 14 Revolution.

وزارة
الثقافة والإرشاد